



The Unchanging Representation of the 1956 Revolution in Public Art in Budapest

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11649/sn.3003>

Melinda Harlov-Csortán

Apor Vilmos Katolikus Főiskola

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2945-217X>

e-mail: melindaharlov@gmail.com

Abstract

Hungary, and especially its capital, Budapest, is famous for its vast number of public artworks. Unlike their impressive quantity and diversity, their representation techniques are rather monotonous. Apart from nostalgia apparent in those works that represent emotionally charged narratives about the past, we can also trace the anxiety of new forms and interpretations, manifesting itself in the constant over-repetition of well-known symbols and representations. The article investigates possible reasons behind the unchanging character of these public artworks despite the increasing number and variety of procurers.

In terms of methodology, this paper follows the author's work on numerous smaller projects and draws on secondary literature, case studies, and content analysis of policy documents and media coverage of particular events. The article presents the memorials dedicated to the 1956 revolution erected in Budapest between 1989 and 2019, focusing on their symbolic and political dimensions as well as physical context.

This work was written at the Author's own expense.

No competing interests have been declared.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2023.

The investigation points out that the range of procurers of public art in Budapest is still not varied, and the lack of expert assessment also prevents contemporary representations. Moreover, the general public does not and cannot play a role in memorialization processes. The observations made in this paper suggest how this particular public art genre manifests nostalgia about the glorious (but failed) historical moment and anxiety of new forms and interpretations.

Keywords: memorials of the 1956 revolution; Budapest; public art; 1989; postsocialism

Introduction

Budapest, the capital of Hungary, has an outstanding amount and variety of public art¹ (Újvári, 2014). While scholars point out that furnishing public spaces with statuary is a historical tradition (Mélyi, 2010a), in the case of Hungary the representation in stone or marble seems to be a contemporary prerequisite of signifying and memorializing any historical figure or event (Wehner, 2020a). This stands in contradiction to the notion that public space is not the locus of consensus but of contestation and hence it is also subject to change (Kertész, 2020). For instance, two focal points of Budapest's Freedom Square, which has an elliptical shape, are the Soviet Memorial (by Károly Antal, 1945) and the Memorial to the Victims of German Occupation (by Péter Párkányi Raab, 2014). After the inauguration of the latter, the subject of the earlier memorial became re-formulated and the focus became on the victims of the Soviet occupation as a parallel to the new commemoration, without transforming the physical form of the former (Pikó et al., 2019).

After the political change in 1989, the types of actors initiating public art projects became more varied: not only politicians but also artists, civil organizations, and religious communities could come up with their own proposals (Boros, 1994). In the case of the Hungarian capital, this possibility was provided by Act XX of 1991 (1991. évi XX. törvény a helyi önkormányzatok és szerveik, a köztársasági megbízottak, valamint egyes centrális alárendeltségű szervek feladat- és hatásköreiről, 1991). As a result, without any central supervision, almost anyone with sufficient financial and technical resources (and connections) can install public artworks on the streets and squares of Budapest (Wehner, 2020a). Likewise, financial arrangements concerning public art projects were also modified following the political change. Monumental landmarks are no longer funded exclusively from the state budget. Instead, tenders, private contributions, or donations from commercial actors can be counted as equally important financial sources. The installation, removal, or transfer of any public artworks, including those that were donated or offered as gifts, only requires permission from the district or city municipality.

1 There are more than 1,100 public artworks just in the downtown area of Budapest, which means at least 35 artifacts per square kilometer (Schrödel, 2017).

As the types and amounts of financial support vary, so do the sizes of the newly installed artworks. In addition, the long and very centralized process of initiation and approval of commemorative projects has given way to procedures undertaken on the municipal level (Boros, 1999). Unlike in the socialist² period, commemorative rituals are now smaller in scale, less pompous, attract a smaller number of participants and are not mandatory to attend (Pótó, 1994).³

Although in the democratic system there is much more flexibility regarding the financial or administrative processes and the number of stakeholders, there are very few modern or space-specific representations. This extreme amount of public art, especially in the capital, does not show any variety but only creates the impression of nostalgia about the represented historical event and a kind of anxiety to adopt modern style. This article analyses the possible reasons for the unchanging representation by focusing on the memorials dedicated to the 1956 revolution by various procurers in Budapest. The first part investigates the “democratization” of memorialization processes by looking at the actors and the types of artworks, and the second one analyzes the 1956 memorials in Budapest from various perspectives, such as their location, procurers, and adopted symbols. The study aims to answer the question why the adopted symbols and materials make these memorials express almost only nostalgia or anxiety.

Actors Erecting 1956 Memorials in Budapest after 1989

The city municipality owns and maintains about 125 statues put up after the political change in Hungary in 1989, out of which 20% have been re-erected. Their re-establishment took place throughout the period under study with different intensity. During the first decade (1989–1999), four re-erected statues were inaugurated, between 2000–2009 – thirteen, and in the last decade (2010–2020) – ten. Interestingly, 60% of them originally come from the socialist period, and 75% were re-established in public space before 2010, when Gábor Demszky (member of the Alliance of Free Democrats)⁴ was the mayor. The remaining ones, which are all located on Margaret Island and represent various historical figures, were re-erected when the mayor was István Tarlós (member of Fidesz party).⁵ Hence, there is no clear connection between the political affiliation of the mayor and the periods or ideologies commemorated in the public space of the city by re-erected artworks.

2 This article follows the common practice of Western historiography whereby the terms “socialist” and “communist” are used as synonyms for the same ideological and political system that was widespread in the discussed territories of Europe after World War II (Roberts, 2004).

3 While these aspects most certainly influence the role of the historical event in contemporary memorialization processes, the current paper focuses exclusively on the material components of memorialization.

4 The Alliance of Free Democrats was a central-liberal party that formed the government coalition together with the Hungarian Socialist Party in 1994–1998 and 2002–2008. Gábor Demszky was the mayor of Budapest in 1990–2010.

5 Fidesz (Young Democrats’ Party) is a (central) right-wing party whose leader is Viktor Orbán; the party was in government in 1998–2002, and has governed since 2010. István Tarlós was the mayor of Budapest in 2010–2019.

Considering the newly installed public artworks maintained by the urban authorities, 45 represent historical figures, 32 are memorials that commemorate historical events, and there are also numerous religious works (e.g. crosses, holy trinity columns), fountains, and genre statues. Accordingly, it can be stated that the urban authorities initiated mostly historical memorials.

Among the represented historical figures, less than 1/3 (16) were active after World War II, and only 1/3 of them (6) were Hungarian: four represented cultural spheres (literature and music), one was a football player, and only one was a politician. Considering historical events, the situation is seemingly opposite, as 21 works commemorate events of the second part of the twentieth century. However, most of them memorialize the fight against Soviet influence (the 1956 revolution) or the oppression of the Soviet system (the gulag system and its Hungarian victims). These works of public art can be understood as a case of counter-memorialization of the socialist period of the country's history (Budapest Galéria, 2022).

Each government in power has also influenced the formation of public spaces, especially in the capital (Harlov-Csortán, 2023). Decisions in this regard were sometimes occasioned by anniversaries. In the first period after the political change, the historical events that were memorialized were those that had been forbidden to remember under the previous political system (e.g. the victims of World War II or the 1956 revolution). Later, the anniversaries of major historical events were celebrated with monuments from designated state budget (Wehner, 2020a). For instance, 1996 saw the celebrations of the 1100th anniversary of the Hungarian state (held during the government of the Hungarian Socialist Party), including the inaugurations of numerous statues of Saint Stephen, the first king of Hungary (Pálffy, 2012). Several Acts provided budget for the mandatory celebration of that date (Act LXXX of 1992, Act CIV of 1994, Act XXX of 1996; 1992. évi LXXX. törvény a Magyar Köztársaság 1993. évi költségvetéséről, 1992; 1994. évi CIV. törvény a Magyar Köztársaság 1995. évi költségvetéséről, 1994; 1996. évi XXX. törvény a Honfoglalás 1100. Évfordulójának Emléknapjáról, 1996). Similar top-down commemoration (both in terms of narrative formation and physical representation) was also the case during the Fidesz government on the occasion of the anniversary of the Treaty of Trianon, which brought territorial and population loss for Hungary. 4 June was declared the Day of National Unity (Act XLV of 2010; 2010. évi XLV. törvény a Nemzeti Összetartozás melletti tanúságtételről, 2010), and the regulations provided funding for a central memorial devoted to the event (1372/2018. (VIII. 13.) Kormány határozat a Steindl Imre Program harmadik ütemével kapcsolatos további döntések meghozataláról, 2018).

The government can also influence the formation of entire urban areas by initiating public artwork projects that define their surroundings, such as the central 1956 memorial, erected in 2006 (for a detailed analysis of the monument see below), or by way of requirements concerning the scenery, as in the case of the reconstruction of Kossuth Square around the Parliament, pursuant to government decision 61/2011 (VII. 13.; 61/2011. (VII. 13.) OGY

határozat a budapesti Kossuth Lajos tér rekonstrukciójáról, 2011). It is important to know that the government in power can shape public space in certain areas of the capital also as the “owner”, as in the Castle area, where not just buildings but also land around them is used and managed by the government. This also defines the public artworks in these locations and their fate.⁶

A new public statue can express a symbolic connection between countries, like the Lech Kaczynski monument at Pope John Paul II Square, formerly Republic Square, proposed in 2017 (Kocsis, 2017). Another case in point is a grandiose statue of the Polish royal couple, Jadwiga of Poland (the daughter of Louis the Great, King of Hungary) and Władysław II Jagiełło (Grand Duke of Lithuania) by Daliutė Ona Matulaitė, which was inaugurated in 2013 by the walls of the Budapest Castle. Proposed (and financed) by the Lithuanian diplomatic corps, it is supposed to express the friendly relations between the three nations (Poland, Lithuania, and Hungary), even though the royal couple has no historical connection to the location. The fate of artworks erected before the political change can also be influenced by the contemporary political context (Pikó et al., 2019). For instance, considering the works from the interwar period that memorialized the territories and communities lost after World War I, only those could be re-erected that express the ideology of that time – namely the support for re-occupying former Hungarian territories in the neighboring countries – less explicitly (the national flag or a map of the country with the lost territories).

Apart from political representatives, any small group (such as residents of a particular street) can initiate a new public art project. Active procurers can also be found among non-profit civil organizations and big for-profit companies erecting imposing statues at their headquarters (Harlov-Csörtán & Lajtai, 2018). Their proposals often aim to regenerate certain locations by creating a special atmosphere, to commemorate a historical figure or event in public space, or to mark the location with the erected artwork. In most cases, it is not considered how that small group and its narrative (to be represented by the public artwork) relate to the broader public, who also uses the same public space (Nagy, 2021). Moreover, there are instances when the non-governmental initiator of a new public art project commissions a particular artist and design without prior expert assessment (Póttó, 2020). One consequence of the absence of expert coordination is that public artworks lost their connection with the surrounding architecture (both in terms of their number and physical scale) (Mélyi, 2010b). Moreover, the artists only need to meet the expectations of procurers, hence instead of artistic aims, more circumstantial aspects (such as the available budget or time) play a crucial role in the process.

The role of experts regarding the assessment and location of artworks in public space evaporated following the re-structuring and re-positioning of their organizations

⁶ The entire project of construction works in the Castle district planned for 2019–2024 can be found at <https://nemzetihauszmennprogram.hu/>

in the period under consideration. The Office of Fine and Applied Arts Consultants used to operate as a separate institute responsible for the expert upkeep and maintenance of the existing and planned works of public art. In 2010, the Office lost its roles, responsibilities, independence, and budget as it was incorporated into the Hungarian Institute for Culture and Arts,⁷ and later (in 2012) – into the Hungarian Creative Art Nonprofit Ltd. In turn, the Budapest Gallery (established in 1979 and operating as an independent entity from 1983), which had similar responsibilities concerning public artworks in the capital, became a department of the Budapest History Museum in 2012 (Budapest Főváros Önkormányzata, 2021). The fate of these institutions led to the elimination of overall expert coordination and aggravated the situation: public art in Budapest is chaotic and often repetitive (Wehner, 2020a).

Considering that after the political change in the country the category of procurers became quite diverse and the variety of artworks increased, one could assume that the scenery of public space in Budapest is rich in artistically varied public artworks. However, this is the case only to some extent as usually there is no discussion or preliminary assessment before or right after the tender for a new work of this kind (Pikó et al., 2019). The municipalities and the government still have a strong role in initiating public art projects and are the ones that support and direct (even covertly) changes in public squares. The fact that public space is shaped by the chaotic mix of political actors (representing district and city municipalities as well as the government) without any expert assessment prevents the possibility of top-down supervision or change (Szegedy-Maszák, 2021).

Memorials of the 1956 Revolution

After the political change of 1989, the most numerous memorials were those dedicated to the 1956 revolution, when Hungarians rose up against the Soviet system and military presence. The short-lived outbreak was brutally suppressed and more people were arrested and killed during a prolonged period of repression (about four years) than during the actual fights. Neither the actions nor the victims were allowed to be commemorated or even mentioned, as the event was officially declared a counter-revolution against the political system (and ideology) which was in power until 1989 (Rainer et al., 1991).

After 1989, control over the past played an important role in legitimizing the contemporary power relations as “[a]nti-communist political forces that competed for power aimed to present themselves as organic outgrowths of their nation’s history and portrayed communism as an enforced detour in the nation’s destiny” (Brunnbauer, 2012, p. 494). They

⁷ The founding document of the merged institute, including its new tasks, is available at <https://net.jogtar.hu/getpdf?docid=A11K2320.MKA&targetdate=&printTitle=Magyar+M%C5%B1vel%C5%91d%C3%A9si+Int%C3%A9zet+%C3%A9s+K%C3%A9pz%C5%91m%C5%B1v%C3%A9szeti+Lektor%C3%A1tus&getdoc=1> (*Magyar Művelődési Intézet és Képzőművészeti Lektorátus alapító okirata, módosításokkal egységes szerkezetben*, n.d.).

often supported those memories and histories that alternated the former master narratives of the past. Similarly, they tended to influence the urban landscape and the messages expressed in it (Valentine, 2004). Hence, after the political change in 1989, the theme of the 1956 revolution could be discussed again but supposedly with a different tone. Indeed, one of the very first laws after the political change declared 23 October (the first day of the 1956 revolution) a national holiday, which also shows the significance of this historical event in the new era of the country.

Urban landscapes themselves are the medium of commemoration, contestation, or competition, where public artworks play a role in the formation of collective memory (Johnson, 1995). For the 1956 memorials, a set of well-known symbols is used such as the national flag with a hole. The 1956 revolution is often presented in connection with other significant historical fights, like World War I, represented by the figure of a fallen soldier (Boros, 2003). By connecting the victims of the World Wars and the 1956 revolution, the historical relevance and importance of the latter event and its participants increase (Szabó, 1991), and the time difference between them becomes obsolete. These memorials resemble former or classical examples and do not show that both 1956 and its commemoration happened recently (György, 2000).

Public art and its physical context are interrelated and mutually influential, particularly in locations which are historically significant (such as Corvin Square, with its *genius loci*). As a result, there are at least five central memorials and locations in Budapest commemorating the events of the 1956 revolution (Wehner, 2020a); the latter have multiple memorials with different procurers. Most of the artworks dedicated to the 1956 revolution were installed by municipalities, and a handful were funded by the government or religious organizations (the Catholic and Protestant Churches). Moreover, some organizations, mainly civil ones, initiated multiple plaques in the same places over the three decades in focus. There are also cases where such artworks were initiated by private individuals. Sometimes it also happened that memorials were offered to be installed in public space, mainly by artists who created them.

Apart from the municipalities, especially right after the political change, among the initiators of new memorials there were numerous participants of the 1956 revolution or relatives of the victims, acting both individually and as members of civil organizations. Accordingly, these memorials express both praise of the actions and sorrow for the lost ones (Boros, 2004). These narratives are often in contradiction with the official memory politics, which tends to represent magnificent and heroic characters and an overall positive image (Berdahl et al., 2000; Creed, 1998; Humphrey, 2002). Laurajane Smith and Gary Campbell emphasize that for the latter one mostly nostalgia is adopted (Smith & Campbell, 2017, p. 613). It is important to note that the nostalgic, romanticized notion of the past could never stimulate progressive artistic representation (Farkas, 2020). Hence both top-down and bottom-up initiated 1956 memorials in Budapest are mostly characterized by conservative style and iconography. There are very few new, modern artistic representations

among them, even though the topic is well-researched and other types of art (such as film or painting) analyze various aspects of this event.

In the city, there is a total of 137 public artworks dedicated to or connected with the 1956 revolution. Approximately 60 of them represent specific figures connected with the historical event, e.g. the leader of the Catholic Church in Hungary at the time, Cardinal József Mindszenty, the politician Anna Kéthly, or the then prime minister, Imre Nagy. On ten memorials, the date of the revolution is clearly stated, while double as many contain typical symbols of the event, such as young boys who actively participated in the fights. There are three memorials which point to the connection between the events in Poland and Hungary at that time.⁸ The same number (three) represent scenes of the revolution, depicting actual sites in Budapest where heavy fights took place between the locals and the Soviet troops. There are eight memorials which commemorate both the victims of the two World Wars and the 1956 revolution. In these cases, no new artworks were installed, only names were added on the plaques.

Less than a quarter of Budapest's memorials dedicated to the 1956 revolution (33) can be named symbolic. Fourteen of them use symbols of grieving that can be seen on gravestones, such as the cross, the kneeling angel, or the eternal flame. Sorrow over the lost revolution is also expressed using natural elements, such as the weeping willow tree (four cases). Five memorials represent revolution or fight without using any date-specific details. There are only ten non-figurative, modern, and abstract artworks commemorating the historical events.

According to many scholars, the statue of Imre Nagy, the prime minister of the 1956 revolution (by Tamás Varga, 1996), was an exception when it was situated between Freedom Square and the Parliament. Partly due to this positioning, it represented a figure who was not exclusively heroic. After its relocation to the exact place where the cubist-style representation of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels once stood at Margit Bridge (2019), Nagy's monument lost its meaning and symbolic content and became almost a genre statue (Németh & Ungváry, 2020).

Apart from the location, other factors that influence the appreciation of public artworks include their historical and aesthetic significance. These aspects can enhance or diminish the intended or perceived meaning or interpretation of the artifact (Wehner, 2020a). In the case of the central memorial of the 1956 revolution installed at its 50th anniversary, we can observe the degradation of significance caused by changes in its physical surroundings. The memorial is located at the former Parade Square, where the oversized Stalin statue used to stand before it was torn down on the first day of the revolution. The memorial was designed by a group of young artists (I-Ypsilon group, 2006) and consists of 2,006 columns of growing height, which form a wedge

⁸ The first mass gathering at the very beginning of the Hungarian revolution aimed to express solidarity with Poland.

with an angle of 56 degrees (the numbers symbolize the dates). The ultimate height of the wedge is the same as that of the former Stalin statue on a pedestal, and the artifact is intended to symbolize the united mass of people who rose against the occupation together (Boros, 2006). Today, the site is no longer a square and the memorial stands between two wings of the newly built Ethnographical Museum. The surroundings became “crowded” and in this way the significance of the size of the memorial (alluding to Stalin statue in a huge empty square) has been lost. The highly abstract representation was criticized by many (“Az 56-osok Emlékmű az 56-os téren (Gyurcsány Vaskeféje)”, 2013; Rab, 2005) and even a kind of counter-monument, a classic representation (by Róbert Csíkszentmihályi, István Fáskerti and Róbert Schilling, 2006), was installed in another significant location on the Buda side (Józsa, 2018).

As can be observed, the 1956 memorials display strong attachment to “classical” symbols and even a denial of new representation and style. This can be attributed to the dominant taste of their initiators (Wehner, 2020a) and a clear, long-established concept of this historical event. The unchanging representation of the 1956 revolution indicates that the artifacts in question do not involve reflection on their contemporary context or presentation of the contemporary findings on and understanding of the past (Mélyi, 2022). Hence a kind of insecurity can be identified as regards facing, engaging, and discussing the past publicly even after more than three decades of democratizing the country, which is also a challenge to passing the memory of the 1956 revolution to the contemporary public and future generations (Senie, 2008).

Conclusions

Most of the public art projects implemented in Budapest after the political change are memorials, and they are mainly didactical, propagandistic, conventional, routine works (Wehner, 2001, 2020a). In order to find out the possible reasons for this, the 1956 memorials were investigated in more detail. Considering that they are a new category, which developed at the time of the political change in the country in 1989, they could have formulated new, modern symbols or representation style. These memorials combine personal and official memories, and they were often procured by witnesses of the historical events. The aims and the topics of 1956 memorials, which can be found in particularly large number in Budapest (Illés, 1987; Wehner, 2020b), express the tastes and views of the initiators.

It is important to note that, as it is in 2022, the majority of all public artworks in Budapest are those installed and owned by the municipalities (both city and district),⁹

⁹ For a full list of these public artworks see https://budapestgaleria.hu/_/kozteri-muveszeti-osztaly/muvek-budapesten/ (Budapest Galéria, 2022).

which means that other potential actors have had a smaller role in shaping the scenery of the city. In the case of properties owned by local municipalities or private owners, the city municipality has no power to influence the formation of public space: the regulations only require expert assessment of the artwork in question, which should be submitted before the object is installed (Act XX of 1991; 1991. évi XX. törvény a helyi önkormányzatok és szerveik, a köztársasági megbízottak, valamint egyes centrális alárendeltségű szervek feladat- és hatásköreiről, 1991; Mélyi, 2010a). Numerous scholars point out problems regarding this condition. Firstly, it is not specified what an expert assessment is, and, secondly, who can provide such a document.

Another problematic aspect is the lack of consultation between district municipalities, which has created confusing scenery, especially in the border areas of the districts (Wehner, 2020b). The ownership and location of public artworks can further complicate the situation regarding their maintenance. There are statues owned by the city municipality but located in public spaces owned by a district municipality and vice versa. In such cases, the use of public space for renovation works incurs extra fees for the “owner” of a given public artwork (Budapest Főváros Önkormányzata, 2021).

Apart from the procurers, another factor that can, at least in theory, influence the urban scenery is the reaction of the target audience: the general public. Based on the fact that there has been no major public reaction against the numerous public artworks in “classical” style, the expectations of the general public in Budapest are claimed to be conservative. This is apparent also in the neglect of the few contemporary memorials. Likewise, there has not been any public event regarding the removal or transfer of a monument (e.g. the Imre Nagy statue). Hence, even decades after the political transformation of the country, in most cases the public does not contribute to the formation of public space (Farkas, 2020). Many scholars (such as József Mélyi, Katalin S. Nagy, Edit Rácz, or Tibor Wehner) point out that the inadequate fine art education (especially regarding contemporary art) (Farkas, 2020) and the importance of language over visual representation to express Hungarian culture and identity are factors of the general public’s conservative taste (Pálffy, 2012).

However, it is important to note that even if the general public does not like a proposed public art project, there is no forum or process through which ordinary people could express their opinion (Kertész, 2020). James E. Young emphasizes the importance of the processual approach to public art projects, which should involve consultation with the public and complex research before decisions are made (Szegedy-Maszák, 2021). One case where such an approach has been adopted in Budapest is the currently developed public art project commemorating victims of wartime rape: it involves research, international discussion, and open public debate (Pető, 2021).

Realizing these challenges, the city municipality plans to submit a proposal to the government regarding the modification of the existing processes and their legal framework (at the time of this research, in 2023–2024). The planned goals are: to foster cooperation and communication between district municipalities, to coordinate and jointly develop

future plans and tasks, to (re-)establish a central expert committee that would formulate requirements for quality assurance with the involvement of the general public, and to organize festivals and events dedicated to contemporary and land art in Budapest. Whether such a proposal is accepted and implemented, and whether it is going to be effective, are subjects for future investigations.

References

- 1372/2018. (VIII. 13.) Kormány határozat a Steindl Imre Program harmadik ütemével kapcsolatos további döntések meghozataláról [1372/2018. (VIII. 13.) Government decision on making further decisions regarding the third phase of the Imre Steindl Program]. (2018). <https://magyarkozlony.hu/dokumentumok/2fbcee278585af54b8227cc1c30acaec8d151794/megtekintes>
1991. évi XX. törvény a helyi önkormányzatok és szerveik, a köztársasági megbízottak, valamint egyes centrális alárendeltségű szervek feladat- és hatásköreiről [Act XX of 1991 on the tasks and scope of authority of the local governments and their bodies, of the Commissioners of the Republic, and of certain centrally governed bodies]. (1991). <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99100020.tv#lbj45idd970>
1992. évi LXXX. törvény a Magyar Köztársaság 1993. évi költségvetéséről [Act LXXX of 1992 on the central budget of Hungary for 1993]. (1992). <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99200080.TV>
1994. évi CIV. törvény a Magyar Köztársaság 1995. évi költségvetéséről [Act CIV of 1994 on the central budget of Hungary for 1995]. (1994). <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99400104.TV>
1996. évi XXX. törvény a Honfoglalás 1100. Évfordulójának Emléknapjáról [Act XXX of 1996 on the Commemoration Day of the 1100th Anniversary of the Foundation of the State]. (1996). <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99600030.TV>
2010. évi XLV. törvény a Nemzeti Összetartozás melletti tanúságtételről [Act XLV of 2010 on the Testimony of National Unity]. (2010). <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1000045.tv>
- 61/2011. (VII. 13.) OGY határozat a budapesti Kossuth Lajos tér rekonstrukciójáról [61/2011. (VII. 13.) Government decision on the reconstruction of Kossuth Square, Budapest]. (2011). <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a11h0061.OGY>
- Az 56-osok Emlékmű az 56-os téren (Gyurcsány Vaskefeje). (2013, July 1). *Belváros, Budapest*. <http://belvaros.blogspot.hu/2013/07/az-56-osok-emlekmu-az-56-os-teren.html>
- Berdahl, D., Bunzl, M., & Lampland, M. (2000). *Altering states: Ethnographies of transition in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*. University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.15976>
- Boros, G. (1994). Újabb pesti szobrok 10.: Emlékmű-metamorfózisok. *Kritika*, 22(11), 28–29.
- Boros, G. (1999). Köztéri művészet Magyarországon I–II. *Beszélő: Új folyam*, 4(6), 75–89.
- Boros, G. (2003). Trianon köztéri revíziója 1990–2002. *Mozgó Világ*, 29(2), 3–21.

- Boros, G. (2004). Őrzött-védett műtárgy – Az idő mókuskereke. *Műértő*. https://web.archive.org/web/20110706221046/http://artportal.hu/content/boros_geza_orzoettvedett_mutargy_az_ido_mokuskereke
- Boros, G. (2006). A tüntetőtábla-erdőktől a vascipőkhig: Pauer Gyula köztéri művei 1988–2005. In A. Szőke & L. Beke (Eds.), *Pauer* (pp. 227–233). MTA Művészettörténeti Kutatóintézet.
- Brunnbauer, U. (2012). Remembering communism during and after communism (review article). *Contemporary European History*, 21(3), 493–505. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960777312000318>
- Budapest Főváros Önkormányzata. (2021). *Köztéri Művészeti Koncepció 2022–2025*. Munkaanyag. https://budapest.hu/Documents/civil_iroda/Budapest%20F%20C%5%91v%C3%A1ros%20C%96nkorm%C3%A1nyzata%20k%C3%B6zt%C3%A9ri%20m%C5%B1v%C3%A9szeti%20koncep%C3%B3ja%20t%C3%A1rsadalmi%20egyeztet%C3%A9sre.pdf
- Budapest Galéria. (2022). *Fővárosi tulajdonú köztéri művek Budapesten*. https://budapestgaleria.hu/_/kozteri-muveszeti-osztaly/muvek-budapesten/
- Creed, G. W. (1998). *Domesticating revolution: From socialist reform to ambivalent transition in a Bulgarian village*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Farkas, V. (2020, June 7). Az ember hősi szobrának eltűnése. *Artportal.hu*. <https://artportal.hu/magazin/az-ember-hosi-szobranak-eltunese/>
- György, P. (2000). *Néma hagyomány. Kollektív felejtés és a kései múltértelmezés 1956–1989-ben (A régmúlttól az örökségig)*. Magvető Kiadó.
- Harlov-Csortán, M. (2023). The role of the location in forming the narration about memorials: Two representational squares in the Hungarian capital during the Cold War. In C. Voss, S. Ferhadbegović, & K. Kralová (Eds.), *Memory cultures in Southeast Europe since 1945: Proceedings of the International Academic Week at Tutzing, October 2021* (pp. 201–218). Peter Lang.
- Harlov-Csortán, M., & Lajtai, M. (2018). *Romák a budapesti köztérben*. Tom Lantos Intézet.
- Humphrey, C. (2002). *The unmaking of Soviet life: Everyday economies after socialism*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501725722>
- Illés, L. (1987). Történelmi emlékek, történelmi emlékhelyek: A magyarországi történelmi emlékhelyek országos katasztere. In A. Román (Ed.), *Egri Nyári Egyetem* (pp. 59–61). ICOMOS.
- Johnson, N. (1995). Cast in stone: Monuments, geography and nationalism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 13(1), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d130051>
- Józsa, K. (2018). *Kortárs válaszok a múlt eseményeire: Építészeti megközelítések három fővárosi 1956-os emlékmű koncepciójában*. BME TDK Portál. <http://tdk.bme.hu/EPK/Kozepkritika/Kortars-valaszok-a-mult-esemenyeire>
- Kertész, L. (2020, June 1). Kéi itt a tér? A budapesti köztér, mint a demokráciadeficit lenyomata. *Artportal.hu*. <https://artportal.hu/magazin/kie-itt-a-ter-a-budapesti-kozter-mint-a-demokraciadeficit-lenyomata/>
- Kocsis, M. (2017). *Javaslat Lech Kaczynski szobor állítására*. Budapest Főváros Közgyűlése. <https://service-einfoszab.budapest.hu/api/dvd/142724>

Magyar Művelődési Intézet és Képzőművészeti Lektorátus alapító okirata, módosításokkal egységes szerkezetben. (n.d.). <https://net.jogtar.hu/getpdf?docid=A11K2320.MKA&targ etdate=&printTitle=Magyar+M%C5%B1vel%C5%91d%C3%A9si+Int%C3%A9zet+%C3%A9s+K%C3%A9pz%C5%91m%C5%B1v%C3%A9szeti+Lektor%C3%A1tus&getdoc=1>

Mélyi, J. (2010a). A jövő alulnézete – Duna-parti szobrok 3. A Szabadság hídtól a Lágymányosi hídig – Göbolyös Luca fotóival. *Artmagazin*, 8(4), 22–27.

Mélyi, J. (2010b). A torzuló duna-korzó – Duna-parti szobrok 1. *Artmagazin*, 8(2), 16–23.

Mélyi, J. (2022). Mit (nem) állítunk? Köztéri átalakulások a Duna-parton Szász Lilla fotóival. *Artmagazin*, 20(5), 48–52.

Nagy, G. (2021, September 25). *Telítődés és kihívás: Beszélgetés Mélyi Józseffel a Főváros most zajló emlékműprojektjéről*. Artportal.hu. <https://artportal.hu/magazin/telitodes-es-kihivas-beszelgetes-melyi-jozseffel-a-fovaros-most-zajlo-emlekmuprojektjerol/>

Németh, M., & Ungváry, K. (2020, July 21). *Van értelme ledönteni a történelmi szobrokat? – interjú Ungváry Krisztiánnal*. Alfahír.hu. https://alfahir.hu/hirek/szobor_szobordontes_tortenelem_ungvary_krisztian_interju_emlekezetpolitika

Pálffy, K. (2012, August 19). Miért rosszak a köztéri szobrok? *Új Szó online*. <https://ujsozso.com/kozelet/miert-rosszak-a-kozter-i-szobrok>

Pető, A. (2021). The new monument of victims of military sexual violence in Budapest. *Hungarian Studies Review*, 48(2), 209–215. <https://doi.org/10.5325/hungarianstud.48.2.0209>

Pikó, A., Bauer, T., Mélyi, J., & Pótó, J. (2019). Szobrok az emlékezetben: Kerekasztal beszélgetés. *Mozgó Világ*. <https://mozgovilag.hu/2019/08/07/szobrok-az-emlekezetben/>

Pótó, J. (1994). Emlékmű és propaganda. *História*, 16(4), 33–35.

Pótó, J. (2020, June 25). *Mennyire legyünk naívak? – Köztér, emlékezet, hatalom Magyarországon*. Artportal.hu. <https://artportal.hu/magazin/mennyire-legyunk-naivak/>

Rab, L. (2005). Ötvenhatos emlékmű 650 millióból. *Népszabadság*. <https://mult-kor.hu/cikk.php?id=10127>

Rainer, M. J., Litván, G., Kozák, G., & Bak, J. M. (1991). *Az 1956-os magyar forradalom: Reform, felkelés, szabadságharc, megtorlás*. Tankönyvkiadó.

Roberts, A. (2004). The state of socialism: A note on terminology. *Slavic Review*, 63(2), 349–366. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3185732>

Schröder, N. A. (2017). *Budapest Településképi Arculati Kézikönyve*. <https://budapest.hu/Documents/V%C3%A1ros%C3%A9p%C3%ADt%C3%A9si%20F%C5%91oszt%C3%A1ly/Budapest%20telep%C3%BCI%C3%A9sk%C3%A9pi%20arculati%20k%C3%A9zik%C3%B6nyve.pdf>

Senie, H. F. (2008). Reframing public art: Audience use, interpretation, and appreciation. In A. McClellan (Ed.), *Art and its publics: Museum studies at the millennium* (pp. 185–200). Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470775936.ch9>

Smith, L., & Campbell, G. (2017). 'Nostalgia for the future': Memory, nostalgia and the politics of class. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 23(7), 612–627. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2017.1321034>

Szabó, M. (1991). A magyar történeti mitológia az első világháborús emlékműveken. In Á. Kovács (Ed.), *Monumentumok az első háborúból* (pp. 46–63). Corvina Kiadó.

Szegedy-Maszák, Z. (2021, July 14). "Vannak, akik szinte minden emlékműre feloldozásként tekintenek" – Beszélgetés James E. Younggal. Artportal.hu. <https://artportal.hu/magazin/vannak-akik-szinte-minden-emlekmure-feloldozaskent-tekitenek-beszelgetes-james-e-younggal/>

Újvári, G. (2014, February 19). Így emlékeznek ők. *Mandiner*. http://mandiner.blog.hu/2014/02/19/igy_emlekeznek_ok_magyar_torteneszek_kedvenc_emlekmuei_ii

Valentine, J. (2004). Art and Empire: Organisational mediation, aesthetic autonomy and contextualising practices. In J. Harris (Ed.), *Art, money, parties: New institutions in the political economy of contemporary art* (pp. 187–214). Liverpool University Press.

Wehner, T. (2001). Budapesti szoborművek: Szubjektív művészeti naplójegyzetek, 1997–1999. *Budapesti Negyed*, 2001(2–3). <https://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00003/00025/wehner.html>

Wehner, T. (2020a, May 23). A budapesti emlékmű- és szobor-túltermelési válság és felszámolása. Artportal.hu. <https://artportal.hu/magazin/a-budapesti-emlekmue-es-szobor-tultermelési-valsag-es-felszámolása/>

Wehner, T. (2020b, July 12). Szobortündérkéek Magyarországon. *Demokrata*. <https://demokrata.hu/magyarorszag/szobortunderkek-magyarorszag-265973/>

Niezmienne sposoby reprezentowania powstania węgierskiego 1956 roku w sztuce publicznej Budapesztu

Abstrakt

Węgry, a zwłaszcza ich stolica, Budapeszt, słyną z ogromnej liczby dzieł sztuki publicznej. W przeciwieństwie do ich imponującej ilości i różnorodności stosowane techniki wizualizacji są raczej monotonne. Oprócz nostalgii widocznej w dziełach, które reprezentują naładowane emocjonalnie narracje o przeszłości, można także dostrzec obawę wobec nowych form i interpretacji, objawiającą się ciągłym nadmiernym powtarzaniem dobrze znanych symboli i przedstawień. Artykuł analizuje możliwe przyczyny niezmienności charakteru dzieł sztuki publicznej tego rodzaju pomimo rosnącej liczby i zróżnicowania ich inicjatorów.

Pod względem metodologicznym artykuł stanowi kontynuację prac autorki nad wieloma mniejszymi projektami i opiera się na literaturze przedmiotu, studiach przypadków oraz analizie deklaracji programowych i relacji medialnych dotyczących poszczególnych wydarzeń. Autorka prezentuje pomniki poświęcone powstaniu węgierskiemu 1956 roku wzniesione w Budapeszcie w latach 1989–2019, skupiając się na ich wymiarze symbolicznym i politycznym oraz kontekście fizycznym.

Jak wynika z przedstawionej analizy, spektrum inicjatorów sztuki publicznej w Budapeszcie nadal nie jest zróżnicowane, a brak fachowej oceny również uniemożliwia zastosowanie współczesnych metod reprezentacji. Co więcej, ogół społeczeństwa nie odgrywa i nie jest w stanie odgrywać jakiegokolwiek roli w procesach upamiętniania. Obserwacje poczynione w artykule wskazują, jak w przedstawianym gatunku sztuki

publicznej przejawia się nostalgia za chwalebnym (choć nieudanym) momentem historycznym oraz obawa wobec nowych form i interpretacji.

Słowa kluczowe: upamiętnienia powstania węgierskiego 1956 roku; Budapeszt; sztuka publiczna; rok 1989; postsocjalizm

Citation

Harlov-Csörtán, M. (2023). The unchanging representation of the 1956 revolution in public art in Budapest. *Sprawy Narodowościowe: Seria nowa*, 2023(55), Article 3003. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sn.3003>